



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/788,478	03/01/2004	Jean-Pierre Julien	1770-300"US"-1 VC/dm	7549	
20988 7	7590 07/29/2005		EXAMINER		
OGILVY RENAULT LLP 1981 MCGILL COLLEGE AVENUE SUITE 1600 MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3			SPIVACK, PHYLLIS G		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1614		
CANADA			DATE MAILED: 07/29/2009	DATE MAILED: 07/29/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/788,478	JULIEN ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Phyllis G. Spivack	1614			
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address			
THE - Extended after second aft	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC ensions of time may be available under the provisions of the SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30). O period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply virure to reply received by the Office later than three menths after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a relication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty tory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT II. by statute, cause the application to become AB	ply be timely filed r (30) days will be considered timely. IHS from the mailing date of this communications ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	cation.		
Status						
1)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on				
2a)□	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposi	tion of Claims					
-	Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are	•		1 [5		
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	withdrawn from consideration.				
•	Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or election requirement.				
Applica	tion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.				
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	·	by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objecti					
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including to the oath or declaration is objected to the same of the same		•			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	·				
,	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for Diagram All bired Some * circle None of:	or foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).			
	1. Certified copies of the priority d					
	2. Certified copies of the priority d			1		
		the priority documents have been	received in this National Stage	е		
*	application from the International See the attached detailed Office action		received			
	See the attached detailed Office action	for a list of the certified copies flot	received.			
			•			
Attachme	nt(s)					
	ice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date			
3) 🛛 Info	ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTo ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or P oer No(s)/Mail Date <u>5-28-04</u> .		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
		 				

Application/Control Number: 10/788,478

Art Unit: 1614

An Information Disclosure Statement filed May 28, 2004 is acknowledged and has been reviewed.

Claims 1-10 are presented and represent all of the claims under consideration.

The disclosure is objected to for the following informalities: In claim 1 the term "antiglutaminergic" is incorrectly spelled. In claims 1 and 7 the term "consisting" appears to be inadvertently omitted.

Appropriate correction is required.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yrjanheikki et al., Proc. National Academy of Sciences, and Lai et al., U.S. Patent 6,710,086.

Yrjanheikki teaches the administration of lipid-soluble tetracyclines, such as doxycycline and minocycline, that inhibit microglial activation through anti-inflammatory and neuroprotective effects, for use in the treatment of stroke. See the Abstract. Lai teaches the administration of doxycycline hyclate or minocycline hydrochloride for use in the treatment of stroke. See column 7, lines 16-17 and 30, as well as column 19, line 37, column 20, lines 13-14 and 34. Both nimodipine and riluzole are characterized as agents for use in the treatment of stroke. Therefore, in view of the combined teachings of Yrjanheikki and Lai, one skilled in the neurology art would have been motivated to

Application/Control Number: 10/788,478

Art Unit: 1614

prepare a composition comprising at least two compounds selected from the group consisting of an inhibitor of microglial activation, such as doxycycline and minocycline, an antiglutaminergic agent, such as riluzole, and a voltage-gated calcium channel blocker, such as nimodipine, for treating symptoms of stroke. Such would have been obvious because in addition to Yrjanheikki's disclosure that minocycline provides stroke protection, Lai teaches both riluzole and nimodipine are known to be useful agents for treating stroke. It is generally *prima facie* obvious to use in combination two or more ingredients that have been used separately for the same purpose. In re Kerkhoven 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA). The determination of an optimal dosing regimen is a parameter well within the purview of those skilled in the art through no more than routine experimentation.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Phyllis G. Spivack whose telephone number is 571-272-0585. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 10:30 AM to 7 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful after one business day, the Examiner's supervisor, Chris Low, can be reached at 571-272-0951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1614

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Phyllis G. Spivack Primary Examiner Art Unit 1614

614 PHYLLIS SPIVACK

July 24, 2005